

Mrs. Nichol admits that her opinion of the hospital is based entirely upon second-hand gossip, and her laboured commendation of the institution therefore requires no serious answer. Miss Simeon quite misapprehends the gravity of the charges made against the management. The eighteen separate allegations which I recently quoted have nothing whatever to do with "wounded vanity." There is an extraordinary similarity between the letters of F. W. D. and Elizabeth Potter, but to term the charges "base lies," "vile accusations," &c., &c., is no answer to my criticism. The last words of the former put her reasons in a nutshell. She has to "get a living." What happens to Nurses "still working in the hospital," who dare to not support the management when ordered to do so, has been sufficiently set forth already in the course of this correspondence. Miss Potter indulges in the customary "emphatic denials," and states that no Nurse has been known to faint in the lecture room for want of nourishment. She admits that Nurses have fainted—perhaps this may be from over-feeding! She will perhaps not venture to deny that night Nurses are aroused on lecture nights an hour or more before their usual time, and are sent to the lecture at 8 p.m. without any food having been provided for them in the Nursing Home, their previous meal having been taken ten hours before. In stating that there is one Nurse to every three patients, Miss Potter misleads the public. If this were true there would be 230 Nurses on day duty and the same number on night duty. Whereas the truth is that there are less than 230 Nurses on the whole staff of the hospital for day duty, night duty, and including those absent on leave or from sickness.

Mr. W. Rathbone states what is not true when he asserts that the charges which I have made were disproved in 1890 before the Select Committee of the House of Lords. I have read their lordships' report very carefully, and find that it condemns in a most unmistakable manner various points in the management of the London Hospital to which I called attention last month. He graciously expresses his approval of their lordships' conclusions, and I should be glad if he would therefore state why the London Hospital Committee have so contemptuously ignored the recommendations made in the Lords' report. Mr. Rathbone refers frequently to his "varied experience in nursing work in all its branches." In all humility I would ask him if he has ever been a Nurse or even a patient in the London Hospital? If not, I claim to have had more practical experience in nursing matters than he has had, and I think it would be more discreet

if he did not discuss a subject upon which he is manifestly ignorant.

I now come to the "Editor of the *Hospital*," who, with amusing inconsistency, abuses at great length your anonymous correspondents, but does not sign his own name. His paper is chiefly characterised by its scurrilous abuse of any one who criticises the management of the London Hospital, and in return his journal is sold in large numbers every week in the wards and out-patient departments of that Institution by one of the Hospital porters, while a standing advertisement of the London Hospital appears week by week in its pages: facts these which are material as showing the recompense which the paper receives for its defensive services, and a possible reason for its chief proprietor's attitude. Mr. Burdett asserts that he has disproved my statements. I say that he has done nothing of the kind, and that if he, or they, had been able to do so, the committee of the London Hospital would have taken at once the only honourable course of demanding a public inquiry into the charges made against their management, whereas they have thus far most conspicuously exhibited their fear of further light being thrown upon any of their proceedings. To give, however, a better proof of the Editor of the *Hospital's* veracity, I would refer readers of the *Pall Mall Gazette* to the Report issued in 1891 of the Lords' Committee on Metropolitan Hospitals, where they will find that this gentleman made upon oath a number of statements which subsequent witnesses proved to be entirely untrue and misleading. He threatened that an action for libel would be brought by the London Hospital against the *Pall Mall Gazette*: it now appears that for this assertion he had neither authority or justification.

It has been stated by various defenders of the Hospital, including Sir Andrew Clark and his co-signatories, Mr. Rathbone and others, that my charges were disproved and disposed of by the Select Committee of the House of Lords, in 1890. The mere fact that these charges were raised three years ago is to my mind a conclusive proof that my assertions were well founded. But, as a matter of fact, reference to the Report of the Lords' Committee proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that these charges were then held to have been justified. To show this I will place in parallel columns certain charges which I made last month, and the conclusions to which their lordships arrived on the evidence submitted to them on the same points in 1890.

---

The "NURSING RECORD" has a Larger Sale than any other Journal devoted solely to Nursing Work.

---

The NURSING RECORD" has a Larger Sale than any other Journal devoted solely to Nursing Work.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)